

that our community, in many ways, continues to suffer because of their plight. To Martini Battistessa, age 65, who threw himself in front of a passing railroad train. To Giuseppe Micheli, age 57, who cut his throat with a butcher knife. To Giovanni Sanguanetti, age 62, who hanged himself. To Stefano Terranova, age 65, who leaped to his death from a three story building. Terranova left a chilling note: "I believe myself to be good, but find myself deceived. I don't know why." The "why?" reverberates even today. Each man, by Executive Order of the President of the United States, had been declared an "enemy alien"; and directed by the Department of Justice to evacuate his California home.

Few readers of morning newspapers that February in 1942 probably paid much attention to the scant reportage of these last desperate acts, dwarfed as they were by news of global warfare. But these four deaths—in Richmond, Vallejo, Stockton and San Francisco—incidental as they might have seemed in the rush of momentous events in the early months of World War II, were nonetheless important pieces in a larger mosaic of an American tragedy.

"Una Storia Segreta: When Italian Americans Were 'Enemy Aliens'" memorializes that tragedy. I first viewed this exhibit in Sacramento with the lawyer, Bill Cerruti, who has done so much to make these long-buried events find their rightful place as historical reality. It is a bold exhibit, as well as a strong refusal by Americans of Italian descent to keep silent about a largely unknown story of arrest, relocation and internment during World War II. It is a story that has remained hidden for a half century because of the silence first imposed by Government, then adopted as a protective cover of shame by those scarred. The exhibit documents and records a painful episode of the Italian experience in America. It is a moving portrayal of the enormity of human deprivation and suffering brought about by Government efforts that violated basic civil rights, efforts motivated largely by ethnic bias, wartime hysteria and a failure of political leadership.

Most Americans know about the internment of Japanese Americans during the Second World War, but few, even in our community, are aware that the Federal Government, also without adequate security reasons, restricted the freedom of 600,000 Italians, legal residents of the United States for decades, many of whom had lived here since the turn of the century and, in fact, were also American citizens.

At the time World War II broke out in 1941, Americans of Italian descent were the largest immigrant group residing in the United States. In addition to the 600,000 foreign-born, millions more were American born. They resided throughout the country. That more Italian Americans were affected by wartime restrictions than Japanese Americans is not of the moment, for injustice can never be quantified; each instance is absolute.

I am pleased to see that the Order Sons of Italy in America's Commission for Social Justice is a co-sponsor of this noteworthy effort. For it was late in the night of December 7, 1941, a day that will indeed live in infamy, and only hours after the bombing at Pearl Harbor, that Filippo Molinari, a founding member of the Order in San Francisco, was confronted at home by three policemen. He was arrested on unspecified charges, detained at the Santa Clara County jail, and thereafter shipped to a detention center in far off Fort Missoula, Montana.

And while it was the Order that later was to galvanize Italian American opposition and political clout, first on the East Coast and then throughout the nation that eventually

would end the hateful "enemy alien" status on Columbus Day, 1942, Molinari was not alone on that fateful night. Within 72 hours of war, thousands of community leaders, newspaper editors and teachers of the language were similarly arrested; and during the course of the year, Government edicts would be directed nationwide at all those of Italian ancestry. Italian language schools were closed; Italian American organizations were harassed; Italian American meetings became suspect. Curfews, residence restrictions and travel curtailments were put in place; searches and seizures of personal property were conducted without the color of law—not to speak of the paranoia, bigotry and military policy that conspired on the West Coast to arrest, relocate and intern some 10,000 of our people. And in community after community across the nation, Italian immigrants were required to register and carry identification cards.

Archibald McLeisch, the poet, tells us that "America was promise." "America" is imprecise as a descriptive geographical term, standing neither for a particular country nor a clearly defined land mass. But it perfectly defines a state of expectation. And this expectation, this promise has always equated with fundamental rights. We were the first people to found a nation on the basis of rights, and individual rights are the foundation of the American identity. No society recognizes a greater range of individual rights entitled to fulfillment under its laws than the United States. Even our failures as a nation are measured in terms of rights. The Declaration of Independence offered the promise of a Government based on rights, and the Constitution not only enumerated them, but guaranteed them as "inalienable," pre-existing rights anterior to and superior to the state.

Yet these inalienable rights were violated with impunity in the early days of World War II, on the flimsiest of accusation, without any finding of wrongdoing or basis in fact. It would be correct to say that the crime was merely being of Italian ancestry. This on the heels of a xenophobic, then existing national origins quota system that had discriminatorily sought to exclude our grandparents as immigrants for two previous decades.

A powerful message was sent and received in Italian American communities nationwide: Italian language and culture, and those who prompted either or both, were not desirable, and represented an inimical danger to the American way. The language was silenced; the culture was suppressed. And the effects remain: the decimation of great national organizations, the loss of Italian language facility by succeeding generations, the cultural amnesia of many Italian Americans, the super-patriotism of many others.

Thousands were forced from their homes, denied the opportunity to pursue their livelihoods, their businesses closed, their assets dissipated, their lives disrupted. And the arrests, the relocations, the internments—these were accomplished without due process of law, notwithstanding the fact that not a single instance was ever documented of an individual of Italian ancestry aiding the enemy, committing an act of espionage, sabotage or fifth column activity. On the contrary, upwards of one half million Italian American men-at-arms, the greatest number of any American ethnic group, were at that moment battling on two war fronts to preserve liberty and justice for all. Clearly, Government claims of military necessity at the time have since been demolished by a generation of scholars; indeed, by the graphic illustrations presented by this exhibit.

The conduct of the Federal Government toward persons who had done no wrong is un-

questionably one of the most shameful in the history of our Republic. This grave and fundamental injustice of treatment of those of Italian ancestry has yet to be acknowledged; in point of fact, it is truly unknown or purposely ignored, or even worse, flatly denied. The exhibit informs the public about this wartime tragedy. Not only does it pay tribute to those who were victimized and stigmatized, but it testifies in significant respects to the contemporary state of Italian Americana. Most important, perhaps, it contributes to a better understanding of how the venom of intolerance can give rise to the maelstrom of persecution to make for such events; and how respect for the rule of law can prevent such occurrences vis-a-vis any minority group, regardless of race, creed, color or national origin.

The American Italian Historical Society is to be commended for organizing a presentation that sheds new light on an historically and socially relevant experience, as is the Calandra Institute of this great University for bringing it to the spiritual capital of the Italian in America—the City of New York. I thank both these distinguished academic entities for having invited me to open it here today.

DISAPPROVAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR CHINA

SPEECH OF

HON. GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, JR.

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1997

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for normal trade relations with China, which is our best option for promoting long-term progress in Chinese society. I am deeply concerned by the efforts of the Chinese Government to interfere with the basic human rights of Chinese citizens, including freedom of faith and religious practice, freedom of speech and thought and the freedom to assemble and petition the government without being crushed by tanks. I believe that every government, every leader has the duty to respect basic human rights, and that no government may use tradition as an excuse for oppressing its own citizens.

I support MFN status for China because I deplore the repressive tactics of the Chinese Government. I believe in the appeal of the United States and the values of freedom this country represents. Engagement with China means a continuation of the trade, investment and personal interaction which breaks down the tyranny of the Chinese state. While engagement has not improved human rights conditions in China as rapidly as any of us would like, I believe interaction with the world economy and American values will help the Chinese people create the conditions necessary for social change. By increasing access to phones, faxes, the Internet and Western media, American engagement has helped the Chinese people circumvent government controls over information. By spurring stupendous growth in China's coastal regions, trade has helped break down government controls over migration from province to province. By introducing western ideas, engagement has spurred a growing "home-church" movement of Chinese who refuse to entrust their souls to state-sanctioned, state-controlled churches. This is real progress.

Severing normal trade relations with China would disrupt the process of social change. This action would hurt the people we really want to help, like the citizens of Hong Kong and the Chinese who now owe their livelihood not to the mercy of the Chinese state but to their own contribution to the free market system. Now is not the time to walk away from our ability to promote change.

Severing normal trade relations with China would also harm American workers, American unions and American businesses. I have recently spoken with aerospace workers and union leaders who disagree with the anti-trade position of their national organizations and who support continued trade with China. They fear that, if Congress chooses to raise trade barriers, American businesses will lose the China airplane market to Airbus and thousands of good, hard-working Americans will lose their jobs without any real change in Chinese policy. The union workers' arguments are persuasive. In 1980, the farmers of Washington State were devastated by a futile attempt to change Soviet policy with a unilateral grain embargo. I hope we will not be destructive and short-sighted as we once again contemplate unilateral trade sanctions. We owe it to the workers and farmers of Washington State and this Nation to learn from the painful, embarrassing experience of 1980 and refrain from adopting more unilateral sanctions.

Finally, severing normal trade relations with China would impose costs on American consumers. The Congressional Research Service has recently estimated that denying China MFN status would cost American families 27 to 29 billion dollars in higher prices. This resolution of disapproval represents a hidden tax on my constituents, fewer jobs for my State and, most important, less freedom for the people of China. I support normal trade relations with China and I hope to work with my colleagues to develop constructive policies which expand freedom in China and convince China's leaders to change their behavior.

REGARDING COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1997

Mr. SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it's ironic, the proximity of the Fourth of July and Cost of Government Day. Of course the national celebration recalling our independence is a day to ponder the blessings of liberty.

Cost of Government Day, however, is quite the opposite, a dramatic reminder of just how much freedom Americans have relinquished to the excesses of big government and profligate spending. This year, Cost of Government Day falls on July 3d.

A somber event, Cost of Government Day occurs later and later each year. The date is determined by calculating the number of days Americans must work in order to earn enough money to pay for the government. This year, it will take 183 days of work to afford to pay for Federal, State, and local taxes and regulatory costs.

The total cost of government in 1997 is estimated at \$3.52 trillion, up from \$3.38 trillion in

1996. This expense translates into a burden averaging \$13,500.00 for every man, woman and child.

If that's not enough to make your sparkler fizzle, think about this: Even with the celebrated balanced budget Congress is forgoing, the Federal Government will spend \$19.2 trillion over the next 10 years and after that, spending for the following ten years is projected to surge to \$29.3 trillion.

Many people think their April 15th tax payment satisfies their civic toll. Unfortunately, it's just the beginning. In addition to taxes, there is a plethora of regulations and government programs which only increase consumer costs, reduce job opportunities, waste valuable time, suppress productivity, and control our lives. The estimated total cost of government regulations for 1997 is \$688 billion which is a 25 percent increase since 1988.

What would Thomas Jefferson, or John Adams say about the government they helped design if they could see it today? Suppose you were to observe the pair discussing the matter over dinner at your favorite neighborhood eatery. According to the Americans for Tax Reform Foundations, \$11.00 of their \$40.00 restaurant bill goes directly to taxes. The remaining \$29.00 covers all other costs of preparing and serving the meal.

The taxes on meals includes federal, state, and local income taxes, Social Security taxes, property taxes, unemployment insurance taxes, workers compensation taxes, utility taxes, licensing fees, and possibly other taxes depending on the state.

In addition to taxes, the restaurant has to deal with various regulatory agencies like OHSA, EPA, IRS, USDA, BATF, NLRB, the local health department, zoning and licensing boards, and more. After that, the proprietor pays his suppliers, his staff, the mortgages, and if he's lucky, he'll have a little left over for himself.

Surely the Signers of the Declaration of Independence has something much different in mind on July 4, 1776, when they affirmed, "Prudence, indeed will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed."

"But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same objective evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security."

Fortunately, our founding heroes designed a system allowing us to throw off the yoke of bondage peaceably, at the ballot box. For this reason, the Fourth of July is a festive celebration overshadowing Cost of Government Day.

Taken together, the back-to-back occasions should serve as a clarion call to those of us who still believe the America dream is worth preserving. Indeed, our Forefathers waged a revolution against far less than American taxpayers are willing to tolerate today.

Independence Day should be our parapet, a demarcation beyond which the cost of government must not intrude. Our objective in Congress, should be to dramatically relieve the tax burden on American families so as to increase economic freedom and to honor life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness as the provi-

dential birthright of all citizens who revel in our glorious independence.

IN HONOR OF THE PHILIPPINE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF OHIO

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1997

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Philippine American Society of Ohio [PASO] as the group inaugurates the PASO Cultural and Civic Center on June 29, 1997.

PASO was founded in 1967 with the purpose of uniting all Filipinos in the Cleveland area. The handful of pioneers has grown over the past 30 years into a solid organization which embraces cultural, civic, social, and humanitarian programs.

Since World War II, Filipinos, mostly professionals, emigrated to America in the thousands. The Filipino population in the Cleveland area is estimated to be close to 3,000 families. The rich traditions of Philippine culture in Cleveland continue to flourish with the help of PASO. In 1985, PASO purchased a 4.9 acre piece of land on which these visionaries hoped to build a Cultural Center. On June 29, after many years of hard work and fundraising, the organization will celebrate the groundbreaking for its Cultural and Civic Center in Parma, OH.

With the completion of the Cultural Center, PASO will be able to hold more events and activities in order to better accomplish the goals and objectives of the organization. My fellow colleagues, please join me in honoring PASO in its efforts to keep the Philippine culture alive in Cleveland.

TESTIMONY OF PETE STARK

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 26, 1997

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the '04' Record recent testimony I presented to President Clinton's Advisory Commission on Consumer Protections and Quality in the Health Care Industry. The need for consumer protections in managed care is great—I urge my colleagues to pass legislation to protect the millions of patients in managed care plans:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN PETE STARK BEFORE THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CONSUMER PROTECTION AND QUALITY IN THE HEALTH CARE INDUSTRY

Secretary Shalala, Secretary Herman, and Members of the Commission: Thank you for this opportunity to present testimony concerning critically needed consumer protections for the millions of Americans in managed care plans.

BACKGROUND

Health care consumers who entrust their lives to managed care plans have consistently found that many plans are more interested in profits than in providing appropriate care. In the process of containing costs patients are often harmed. My constituent mail has been full of horror stories explaining the abuses that occur at the hands of HMOs and other forms of managed care.